UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,200	04/13/2004	Silvano Maffeis	FREI.P-044-2-P1741US	5868
	7590 05/04/200 nt Law Firm LLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 4850)	BLAIR, DOUGLAS B		
FRISCO, CO 80443-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket-oppedahl@oppedahl.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/824,200	MAFFEIS, SILVANO		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DOUGLAS B. BLAIR	2442		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Fe This action is FINAL. 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 15-41 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-41 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	rn from consideration.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of th	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/22/05 and 3/7/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 15-23, 25 and 26 in the reply filed on 2/14/2009 is acknowledged. Claim 24 has been rejoined as the combination linking claim 25 has been found to be allowable over the prior art (See MPEP section 809 for detailed explanation).

Claims 27-41 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 2/14/2009.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/824,200 Page 3

Art Unit: 2442

Claims 15-26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,779. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Claim 15 of the current application is directed towards a method which performs the same functions and obtains the same result as claim 10 of the '779 patent. Claims 16-23 are obvious variants that do render these claims patentably distinct from claim 10 of the '779 patent.

Claim 24 of the current application is directed towards a method that performs the same function in the same manner as the program in claim 11 of the '779 patent.

Claim 25 of the current application is directed towards a method that performs the same function in the same manner as the program in claim 13 of the '779 patent.

Claim 26 of the current application is directed towards a system that performs the same function in the same manner as the system in claim 1 of the '779 patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "said code" in the last limitation of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 26 is a system comprised of elements which are disclosed as possibly being software. Because claim 26 is directed towards software per se it does not fit into any of the statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 7,458,082 to Slaughter et al.

As to claim 24, Slaughter teaches a method of operating a computer connected to a wired computer network, comprising: implementing on the computer at least one transport protocol adapter with a logic to interface with a transport protocol, receiving at least one of message oriented middleware (MOM) command tokens and of MOM message tokens from an application running on a mobile wireless device serving as client, via said transport protocol adapter and using said transport protocol, sending MOM message tokens to a client via said transport protocol adapter and using said transport protocol, and exchanging MOM message tokens with a

MOM client implemented on a computer of said wired computer network, and said code comprising software code implemented to receive and send JMS (Java Message Service) MOM tokens (See Figure 34 and corresponding disclosure, the XML messages are the tokens).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-23, 25, and 26 are allowed over the prior art.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 15, 25, and 26 are allowable over the prior art as the prior art was not found to teach or suggest the specifically claimed relationship between the client and message proxy claimed by the applicant including the specifically claimed topic and queue relationship and the forwarding feature of the last limitation of teach claim.

As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/824,200 Page 6

Art Unit: 2442

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442